

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-29 are pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 12-14, 20, 21, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as clearly anticipated by JP 56-88650 to Ooyama et al. (herein "Ooyama"). Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Ooyama and U.S. patent 4,228,376 to Mabuchi. Claims 5, 7, 8, 9, 15, 17, 23, 24, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Ooyama and JP 06-189504 to Yaguchi et al. (herein "Yaguchi"). Claims 6 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Ooyama and Yaguchi and further in view of Mabuchi. Claims 10, 18, 22, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Ooyama and JP 55-133651 to Ito. Claims 11, 25, 19, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Ooyama and Ito and Yaguchi.

Initially, applicants wishes to thank Examiner Tamai for the interview granted applicants' representative on June 8, 2006. During the interview the outstanding rejections were discussed in detail. Further, during the interview amendments clarifying certain claimed features were also discussed; in particularly it was discussed to amend the claims to clarify the structure of the conductive pattern on the claimed "base board". The present response sets forth amendments clarifying that feature. The Examiner indicated any such amendments would likely raise new issues, and thus should be filed in a RCE, and that an update search would be conducted in view of such amendments. Thereby, such amendments are currently submitted herein with a RCE.

Addressing the above-noted rejections, those rejections are traversed by the present response.

As noted above the claims are amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, independent claim 1 now further recites that the flat disc-shaped

electrical parts mounting base board is “formed of a conductive material on which a plane conductive pattern is formed”. That subject matter is fully supported by the original specification, for example, at page 8, lines 18-21. That feature recited in the claims is believed to further clarify the claims over the applied art.

According to the claimed features, and with reference to Figure 1 in the present specification as a non-limiting example, the printed circuit board 23 is formed of a conductive material on which a plane conductive pattern is formed; in Figure 1 that plane conductive pattern is formed on the bottom shown surface of element 23. Ooyama is not believed to disclose or suggest any such feature.

The outstanding Office Action cites Ooyama to disclose a flat disc portion 10D with plane or contact electrodes 11. In that respect applicants note Ooyama discloses the use of sector-shaped commutator pieces 11A-11C that are separate from base 10 and that are laid on top of base 10, and a varistor 12 including electrodes 12A-12C. From that disclosure in Ooyama it appears clear that the element 10D, cited in the Office Action as corresponding to the claimed “flat disc-shaped electrical parts mounting base board”, does not have a plane conductive pattern formed on a surface thereof. Instead, in Ooyama separate commutator pieces 11A-11C are laid on the element 10D to provide conductive patterns.

The claims have a contrary structure in that in the claims, and again with reference to Figure 1 in the present specification as a non-limiting, the printed circuit board 23 itself is formed of a conductive material on which a plane conductive pattern is formed. Ooyama does not disclose the element 10D having such a structure, but instead requires additional separate commutator pieces 11A-11C to include a conductive pattern and to be coupled to the element 10D.

In such ways, Ooyama also does not teach or suggest a single electrical parts mounting base board that has one surface that faces a rotor and a second opposite surface that

has a plane conductive pattern formed thereon to provide contact electrode parts. In Ooyama such different sections are formed on different elements. That is, in Ooyama the commutator pieces 11A-11C and the electrodes 12A-12C are not formed as part of a base 10 having an opposite side facing a rotor.

In view of these foregoing comments, the claims as currently written are believed to clearly distinguish over Ooyama.

Moreover, no teachings in any of the further secondary cited references to Mabuchi, Yaguchi, or Ito are believed to cure the above-noted deficiencies in Ooyama.

In view of these foregoing comments, applicants respectfully submitted the claims as currently written distinguish over the applied art.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

GJM:SNS\dt

I:\ATTY\SNS\20'S\206470\206470US-AM4.DOC



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423